

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 22, 1999

LB 142

the body. This amendment deals with the issue of how motor vehicle funds are allocated within the subdivision. Right now, the allocation to subdivisions is schools 22 percent, coun...or schools 60 percent, counties 22, municipalities 18 percent, except most recently in a case of Douglas County when that's a little different. But a key point is that, compared to the past, the valuation base for property tax levies is decreased. The current provision for subdivisions and, in particular, schools is that money from motor vehicles receipts is allocated to the general operating fund as an accountable receipt. It is not for building funds, it is not for bond funds. The difficulty with this is for schools, because it's an accountable receipt, General Fund receipts to a school will go up compared to what they were. In a case of an equalized district, because these receipts are accountable receipts, state aid would be reduced. Building fund receipts would go down simply because the valuation base has been reduced, and the bond levy likely would go up because you have a smaller valuation base on which to collect the money you need to service the bonds. The net effect of all this on an equalized school district would be to transfer the funding obligation from the state to local property tax. You would reduce the amount of state aid but you would increase the property tax because the bond levy would be higher. The net effect on a nonequalized district would be that you would lower the General Fund levy and, thereby, they would gain, a nonequalized school would gain relatively...relative to an equalized school and then, of course, also you would raise the bond levy, if there were any. This particular proposal, the one in amendment, whatever it is, would allow the same allocation among the General Fund, bond issue and the building issue that was used by this subdivision the past year. So this is a proposed solution to this difficulty. I would point out that the problem I think with it is that it ignores the fact that we have taken motor vehicle receipts out of the property tax base. And I think that, at least over the longer term, we need to recognize that that change has occurred. We no longer consider motor vehicles part of the valuation base and we should get to the point where subdivisions act accordingly. The reason I am going to withdraw this amendment is that I'm hoping that I can come up with a modification to it that addresses what I think is a problem that I've just mentioned. So with that, I will withdraw the amendment and I thank you, Mr. President.